Floodplain Management: No Adverse Impact





Description

"No Adverse Impact" is a managing principal and policy goal developed by the Association of State Floodplain Managers (ASFPM) to support long-term, sustainable approaches to reducing the nation's flood losses now and in the future. In essence, a "No Adverse Impact Floodplain" is one where the action of one property owner does not adversely impact the flooding risk for other properties, as measured by increased flood stages, flood velocity, flows, or the increased potential for erosion and sedimentation.

The No Adverse Impact policy is proposed to be implemented nationwide at a local level through a range of approaches based on what is most effective for any particular management area. The concept promotes local accountability for developing and implementing a comprehensive plan and strategy for the floodplain. Examples of implementation include enforcement of regulations and master plans, as well as delivery of programs and services.

Advantages

- ★ Sustainable flood policy
- ★ Reduces future flood damages
- ★ Manages floodplain for highest net social benefit
- ★ Promotes protection of the natural/beneficial functions of floodplains
- ★ Flexible concept open to a wide range of local approaches

Disadvantages

- © Requires community to define what 'No Adverse Impact' means on a local level
- ② Initiatives of other communities may or may not be conducive to the local situation

Floodplain Manage	ment: No Adverse Impact		
Implementation Considerations	Community needs to determine implementation 'tools' (ordinances, design standards, master plans, etc.) and the function of each		
	Consideration of individual property rights		
	• Public education		
	• Identification of range of hazard factors and incorrect techniques to minimize impacts	poration of mitigation	
Example Communities	 DuPage County, IL □ Compensatory storage = 1.5 x volume floodpla □ 0' Rise in floodplain elevations for all developm □ Floodplain mapping based on future developme □ No net loss of wetlands - mitigation ratios of 1. □ Mitigation for any riparian function impacted be □ No variances for floodplain standards □ 1' freeboard required, even for structures outside □ Stormwater management plan and capital impre □ Buyouts of structures in flooded areas, including • Maricopa County, AZ □ Required total retention of 100-year, 2-hour run □ Adoption of erosion setback zones along water □ Area Drainage Master Study - ID floodprone a structural solutions □ Watercourse Master Plans (smaller-scale detail) 	nents ent conditions 5:1 to 3:1 by development de floodplain ovement projects ag use of local funds noff (2.5-3" rain) courses reas and structural/non- led evaluation/solutions) with	
	 Charlotte-Mecklenburg, NC New development must stay outside the 1/10'-r ⇒ Floodplain mapping/regulations based upon ult watershed ⇒ 1' freeboard protection above 'ultimate' future ⇒ Local adoption of water quality stream buffer r ⇒ Mecklenburg County Floodplain Management ⇒ Preparation of Flood Hazard Mitigation Plans ⇒ Stormwater management program funded by st 	ise floodway imate development in upstream flood elevation regulations Guidance Document based on watershed areas	
References	No Adverse Impact: A Common Sense Strategy to February 2002 Task Force Materials.		
	No Adverse Impact Floodplains: A White Paper, Materials.	March 2002 Task Force	
	 No Adverse Impact, Status Report: Helping Comn 2002 Task Force Materials. 	nunities Implement NAI, August	
	 No Adverse Impact Power Point Presentation, adaptive November 19, 2002 Task Force Materials. 	pted from ASFPM presentation,	
Floodplain Task Force	Fact Sheet 7	November 19, 2002	